

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 12 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action mailed December 1, 2006, the Examiner withdrew the indicated allowability of some claims although claims 5-11 and 15-17 remain allowed and claim 13 was found to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. However, claims 1-4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mabuchi (of record). Claim 18 was rejected as anticipated by Jones (of record). Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Jones in view of Mabuchi.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the bases for the rejections and requests reconsideration and further examination of the rejected claims.

In a telephone conference with the Examiner on December 20, 2006, applicant's undersigned representative emphasized the fact that both cited references (Jones and Mabuchi) teach the use of horizontal stabilizers, which is not present in the instance application. Moreover, neither of these references teach decoupling the propeller from the trailing edge of the wing a minimum setback distance of 20% of the propeller diameter, as described in more detail in the specification at page 11, line 11.

During the telephone conference, the Examiner suggested amending the rejected independent claims to recite that the motor enclosure in claim 1 has no horizontal stabilizer and that the airfoil in claim 18 has no fuselage or horizontal stabilizers associated therewith. In addition, it was recommended that the setback distance be inserted as a minimum of 20% of the propeller diameter.

Applicant has thus amended claims 1, 12, and 18 to recite that the predetermined setback distance is a minimum distance of 20% of the diameter of the propeller. In other words, this means the distance is no less than 20% of the propeller diameter. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite the minimum profile motor enclosure to have no horizontal stabilizers, and claims 12 and 18 both recite the airfoil as having no fuselage or horizontal stabilizers.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the remaining rejected claims are now in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner finds minor

informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:alb

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

920076.401 / 913904_1.DOC